

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12-54, 58-60, 62, 63 and 66-71 were previously pending in this application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12-54, 58-60, 62, 63 and 66-71 have been rejected. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12-54, 58-60, 62, 63 and 66-71 are currently pending.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 19-30, 32, 36-46, 48-54, 58-60, 62, 63 and 66-71 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,623,613 to Rowe et al. (“Rowe”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,565 to Legall et al. (“Legall”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 to Matthews, III et al. (“Matthews”). The applicants respectfully disagree. As will be described in detail below, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying a *representation* of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a *single graphical user interface window* in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed.

Rowe teaches a system for displaying programming information. Rowe teaches that programming information is presented via a schedule display having a category display, a subcategory display and a program display. Rowe does not teach interactive selection or navigation of individual content items including interactive data. Rowe also does not teach displaying interactive data and program data within the schedule display. Further, Rowe does not teach displaying a representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user.

Within the Office Action, there are contradictory statements regarding the teachings of Rowe. On page 5 of the Office Action, it is recognized that Rowe is silent on selecting interactive navigation of the individual content item. [Office Action, page 5] Within the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, it is argued that the “program summary panel of Rowe is data that is derived by interacting with the system, but is not interactive in nature.” [Office Action, page 2] As described above, Rowe does not teach interactive selection or navigation of individual content items including interactive data. Further, Rowe also does not teach displaying interactive data and program data within the schedule display. Still further,

Rowe does not teach displaying a representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user.

Legall teaches an integrated search of electronic program guide, internet and other information resources. Legall teaches a power search tool that enables a user to search an electronic program guide and other information resources with one search. Legall also does not teach displaying a representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. Further, Legall does not teach displaying a *representation* of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed.

Matthews teaches an electronic program guide with hyperlinks to target resources. Matthews teaches that the electronic program guide also includes hyperlinks integrated as part of the grid. [Matthews, col. 9, lines 56-57, Figure 5] Matthews teaches that a hyperlink browser resides in memory and is executable on the processor. [Matthews, col. 4, lines 48-49] Matthews further teaches that when a viewer activates a hyperlink from the electronic program guide, the user interface unit launches the browser to activate the target resource specified by the hyperlink. [Matthews, col. 4, lines 53-58] Matthews does not teach that if interactive data is selected, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are both displayed within the single graphical user interface window. Matthews also does not teach displaying the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. Further, Matthews does not teach displaying a *representation* of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed.

As described above, Rowe does not teach displaying a representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As also described above, Legall does not teach displaying a representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As further described above, Matthews does not teach displaying a *representation* of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. Accordingly, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying a representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. Further, as described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying a *representation* of

individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed.

In contrast to the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination, the content navigator graphical user interface system and method of the present invention enables a user to display, access and navigate among a multiplicity of internet websites and television programming channels to access a multiplicity of categories, channels and individual content of potential interest to the user. The system and method of the present invention provide comprehensive displaying of such categories, channels and individual content to enable effective access and navigation therein, while enabling the use of substantial screen area for individual content of potential interest and providing access to linked information and increasing searching capabilities. The system also enables the user to navigate and select among the categories, related channels and associated individual content, including interactive data, from the same screen. The system of the present invention further enables the user to interactively navigate in the individual content. The individual content sources include interactive data and television programming sources. If interactive data, such as a website, is selected, the representation of the channels and the interactive data are both included within a single graphical user interface window. The system of the present invention also displays the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying a representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user.

Within a previous Office Action, it was recognized that Matthews did not teach that a browser launched when a hyperlink is selected, was displayed within the same window as the electronic program guide. [Office Action mailed May 16, 2006, page 3] Now, within the Response to Arguments section of the present Office Action, this statement is contradicted by the argument that “Matthews teaches displaying the representation of content items (television programming using the preview pane to display clips of programming) and hyperlinks (interactive data) associated with the selected channel (using the focus frame) upon selection of the channel by the user *within a single window*. [Office Action, page 3, emphasis added] This is clearly contrary to the teachings of Matthews, as recognized within the previous Office Action. Matthews teaches that the browser 106 is separate from the electronic program guide 104. [Matthews, col. 8, lines 62-67, Figure 4]

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a display system comprising a display, a communications interface coupled to the display to provide an interface to one or more sources for individual content items and a single graphical user interface window presented on the display. The graphical user interface window of Claim 1 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data. Within Claim 1 it is specified that the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified in Claim 1 that if interactive data is selected, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are *both displayed within the single graphical user interface window* and wherein the graphical user interface window displays the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

Claims 3, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 14 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 3, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 14 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 19 is directed to a display system comprising a display, a communications interface coupled to the display to provide an interface to one or more sources for individual content items, a single graphical user interface window presented on the display and means for enabling the user to select among the set of content categories, the related set of channels, and the associated individual content items. The single graphical user interface window of Claim 19 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content

items include television programming and interactive data. Within Claim 19 it is specified that the single graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified in Claim 19 that if interactive data is selected, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window*** and wherein the graphical user interface window displays the representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 19 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

Claims 20-23 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 19. As discussed above, the independent Claim 19 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 20-23 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 24 is directed to a display system comprising a display, a communications interface coupled to the display to provide an interface to one or more sources for individual content items, a single graphical user interface window presented on the display and means for establishing an interactive data connection through the communications interface. The single graphical user interface window of Claim 24 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data. Within Claim 24 it is further specified that the single graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified within Claim 24 that if interactive data is selected, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window*** and wherein the graphical user interface window displays the representation of

individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

Claims 25-28 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 24. As discussed above, the independent Claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 25-28 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 29 is directed to a display system comprising a display, a communications interface coupled to the display to provide an interface to one or more sources for individual content items and a single graphical user interface window presented on the display. The single graphical user interface window of Claim 29 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming, interactive data and extended content. Within Claim 29 it is specified that the single graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, to select individual content items associated with the displayed channel, and to select extended content. It is further specified within Claim 29 that if interactive data is selected, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window*** and wherein the graphical user interface window displays the representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

Claims 30 and 32 are both dependent upon the independent Claim 29. As discussed above, the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 30 and 32 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 36 is directed to a display system comprising a display, a communications interface coupled to the display to provide an interface to one or more sources for individual content items and a single graphical user interface window presented on the display. The single graphical user interface window of Claim 36 includes a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of selectable channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items in each selectable channel include information that is related to the selectable channel, the related information including television programming and interactive data. It is specified in Claim 36 that the single graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. Within Claim 36 it is further specified that if interactive data is selected, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window*** and wherein the single graphical user interface window displays the representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

Claims 37-46 and 48-52 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 36. As discussed above, the independent Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 37-46 and 48-52 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 53 is directed to a method of enabling a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel, in a system that includes a single

graphical user interface window including a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category, and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data. The method of Claim 53 comprises displaying the representation of the content categories, enabling the user to select a desired content category, displaying the representation of a plurality of the channels in a set of channels related to the selected content category, enabling the user to navigate interactively in the individual content items, enabling the user to navigate among the representation of the content categories, the representation of the related channels, and the individual content items from the single graphical user interface window, wherein if the user navigates to interactive data, then the representation of the plurality of channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window***, enabling the user to select a desired channel and displaying the representation of the individual content items associated with a selected channel, wherein displaying the individual content enables the individual content items associated with the selected channel to be displayed with the set of channels. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a selected channel. Further, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach that if the user navigates to interactive data, then the representation of the plurality of channels and the interactive data are both displayed within the single graphical user interface window. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 53 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

Claims 54, 58-60, 62 and 63 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 53. As discussed above, the independent Claim 53 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 54, 58-60, 62 and 63 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 66 is directed to a display system comprising a display and a single graphical user interface window presented on the display comprising a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with each of the channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data. Within Claim 66 it is specified that the single graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category and to



select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified in Claim 66 that if interactive data is selected, then the representation of the set of the channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window***, and wherein the graphical user interface window displays the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 66 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

The independent Claim 67 is directed to a computerized method comprising displaying a single graphical user interface window, displaying in the single graphical user interface window a representation of a set of content categories, displaying in the single graphical user interface window a representation of a set of channels, wherein the set of channels is associated with a displayed content category, displaying the single graphical user interface window a representation of individual content items, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data, receiving, via the graphical user interface window, user selections of a represented content category, a represented channel and a represented content item, displaying ***both the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data within the single graphical user interface window*** if the user selects interactive data and displaying the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of a channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 67 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

The independent Claim 68 is directed to a display system comprising a display and a single graphical user interface window presented on the display comprising a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with each of the channels,

wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data and the representation of individual content items comprise hyperlinks, wherein the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel, wherein the individual content item is selected by selecting a hyperlink associated with the individual content item, wherein if interactive data is selected by selecting an appropriate hyperlink, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window*** and wherein the graphical user interface window displays the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of a channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 68 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

The independent Claim 69 is directed to a computerized method comprising displaying a single graphical user interface window, displaying in the graphical user interface window a representation of a set of content categories, displaying in the graphical user interface window a representation of a set of channels, wherein the set of channels is associated with a displayed content category, displaying the graphical user interface window a representation of individual content items, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data and the representation of individual content items comprise hyperlinks, receiving, via the graphical user interface window, user selections of a represented content category, a represented channel, and a represented content item, wherein the individual content item is selected by selecting a hyperlink associated with the individual content item, displaying ***both the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data within the single graphical user interface window*** if the user selects interactive data by selecting an appropriate hyperlink and displaying the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of a channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of a channel by the user,

within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 69 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

The independent Claim 70 is directed to a device comprising a display and a single graphical user interface window presented on the display comprising a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with each of the channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data and the representation of individual content items comprise hyperlinks, wherein the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel, wherein the individual content item is selected by selecting a hyperlink associated with the individual content item, wherein if interactive data is selected by selecting an appropriate hyperlink, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window*** and wherein the graphical user interface window displays the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of a channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 70 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

The independent Claim 71 is directed to an apparatus comprising a display and a single graphical user interface window presented on the display comprising a representation of a set of content categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with each of the channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data and the representation of individual content items comprise hyperlinks, wherein the graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel, wherein the individual content item is selected by selecting a hyperlink

associated with the individual content item, wherein if interactive data is selected by selecting an appropriate hyperlink, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window*** and wherein the graphical user interface window displays the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of a channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 71 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination.

Within the Office Action, Claim 31 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe, Legall and Matthews in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,532,754 to Young et al. (hereinafter “Young”). The applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 31 is dependent upon the independent Claim 29. As discussed above, the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claim 31 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 13, 15, 18, 33-35 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe, Legall and Matthews in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 to Shoff et al. (hereinafter “Shoff”). The applicants respectfully disagree. Shoff teaches an interactive entertainment system for presenting supplemental interactive content together with continuous video programs. Shoff teaches supplying supplemental interactive content presented alongside traditional broadcast programs. Shoff does not teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews nor their combination teach displaying within the graphical user interface window the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. Accordingly, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews, Shoff nor their combination teach or make obvious, displaying within the graphical user interface window the representation of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user.

Claims 13, 15 and 18 are all dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 13, 15 and 18 are all allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 33 is directed to a display system comprising a display, a communications interface coupled to the display to provide an interface to one or more sources for individual content items and a single graphical user interface window presented on the display, wherein the graphical user interface window is generated by a content description language. The single graphical user interface window of Claim 33 includes a representation of a set of categories, a representation of a set of channels related to a represented content category and a representation of individual content items associated with the represented set of channels, wherein the individual content items include television programming and interactive data. Within Claim 33 it is specified that the single graphical user interface window enables a user to select a displayed category, to select a displayed channel related to the displayed category, and to select an individual content item associated with the displayed channel. It is further specified in Claim 33 that if interactive data is selected, then the representation of the set of channels and the interactive data are ***both displayed within the single graphical user interface window*** and wherein the graphical user interface window displays the representation of individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user. As described above, neither Rowe, Legall, Matthews, Shoff nor their combination teach displaying within the single graphical user interface window the *representation* of the individual content items associated with a channel upon selection of the channel by the user, within a single graphical user interface window in which a representation of content categories and a representation of channels are also displayed. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 33 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Shoff and their combination.

Claims 34 and 35 are both dependent upon the independent Claim 33. As discussed above, the independent Claim 33 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews, Shoff and their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 34 and 35 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 47 is dependent upon the independent Claim 36. As discussed above, the independent Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their

combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claim 47 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe, Legall, Matthews in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,673,089 to Yuen et al. The applicants respectfully disagree. Claims 16 and 17 are both dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Rowe, Legall, Matthews and their combination. Accordingly, the dependent Claims 16 and 17 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be greatly appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,  
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: May 9, 2007

By: Jonathan O. Owens  
Jonathan O. Owens  
Reg. No. 37,902

Attorneys for Applicants